DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 133 HE 009 671

AUTHOR Jabker, Eugene H.; Halinski, Ronald S.
TITLE The Invisible Faculty in Higher Education: Temporary Faculty.
INSTITUTION Illinois State Univ., Normal.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Ontario, Canada, March 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Governance; Higher Education; *Personnel Policy; School Policy; *Surveys; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Employment; Teacher Participation; *Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS Department Chairpersons; Illinois State University; *Temporary Employees

ABSTRACT

Data about the temporary faculty at Illinois State University were collected to determine the personal and institutional conditions of temporary employment that may inhibit participation in the full range of faculty activities. A questionnaire was developed and sent to all (984) teaching faculty, institutional records were examined and selected, and department chairpersons and temporary faculty were interviewed. Return rate for the questionnaire was 57 percent. In general, temporary faculty are younger, have fewer years of teaching experience, and do not have the terminal degree in their discipline. Otherwise, there are few significant differences between the temporary and regular faculty in terms of what they want to do on the job, the extent to which they feel their opinions should be considered by the chairperson and colleagues in various departmental decisions, or the level of job satisfaction. However, there are many differences regarding the extent to which they are expected to be involved in such matters. Temporary faculty are hired to teach at Illinois State but not to participate in governance matters of the department or the University. In essence, temporary faculty are "invisible" due not so much from personal preference but more from the intentional and unintentional consequences of institutional policies. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Session #21.15

Printed in U.S.A.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Eugene H. Jabker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND

ED152133

KE 009671

THE INVISIBLE FACULTY IN HIGHER EDUCATION: TEMPORARY FACULTY*

Eugene H. Jabker and Ronald S. Halinski
Illinois State University

Temporary faculty at four-year universities and colleges may constitute a potential resource as well as a problem of increasingly significant proportions in the years ahead. Data from a study done by Tuckman and Vogler of Florida State University's Center for the Study of Education and Tax Policy (1978) indicated the rate of increase since 1972-73 for part-time faculty members at four-year institutions was more than four times the rate for full-time faculty. By 1976-77, approximately 25 percent of the faculty were part-time and it may be assumed that this trend may continue well into the 1980s.

From an institutional perspective, temporary faculty provide greater flexibility and adaptability than regular faculty to shifting enrollment patterns, budgetary constraints, changing curricular emphases and vacancies which are difficult to fill for one reason or another. On the other hand, the lack of an institutional commitment for continuing employment may produce a segment of the faculty who have neither incentives nor obligations to do more than meet the minimal conditions of the specific contractual arrangements whether it be teaching, research, or service. Under these conditions, it may be unlikely that the majority of temporary faculty will be involved in the full range of activities expected of regular faculty, thereby truncating the "real" faculty to a percentage of the total number of persons identified as such. In this sense, the temporary faculty become the "invisible" faculty of an institution.

In an earlier study (Jabker and Halinski, 1978), the relationships between instructional development activities and faculty rewards were examined. Among the data that were collected was a phenomenon that is central to this study but was of incidental value to the previous effort, that is, very few temporary faculty were participants in the University's Instructional Development Program. Since 1972, Illinois State University has devoted well over one million dollars from its regular budget to support more than 260 projects designed to improve instruction undertaken by approximately 400 faculty under the aegis of the Instructional Development Program. More than 800 faculty have applied for support since 1972, which, when repeat applications are discounted, represents approximately 30 to 40 percent of the total faculty; however, very few of these 800 persons were temporary faculty--less than 12 percent. When the level of representation among the applicants from each constituent group--temporary, regular without tenure, and tenured faculty--are compared, the temporary faculty are under-represented each year; whereas, the latter two groups are over-represented. Although the temporary faculty comprise approximately one-third of the total headcount faculty and generate almost one-fourth of all instructional credit hours fewer than 6% requested support during any given year--the average being closer to 3%. Why such a large segment of the faculty were not involved more in this program to improve instruction was puzzling and suggested the possibility that the conditions of temporary employment might be symptomatic of other problems in the University.

---

*Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, March, 1978.

Illinois State was 120 years old in 1977; however, in many ways, the present-day institution is little more than 10 to 15 years old. For more than a century, the primary mission of Illinois State Normal University was the preparation of teachers for elementary and secondary schools. Like many other former normal schools, it was not until the 1960s that the collegiate structure was established, the mission was expanded to offer liberal arts and applied science programs in addition to teacher preparation, doctoral programs were introduced, and the name of the institution was changed to Illinois State University. Other significant changes included the rapid growth of student enrollment, extraordinary expansion of physical facilities, and a corresponding increase in the number of faculty hired to teach the classes, create the new curricula and programs for the "new" University. In addition, a series of Master Plans for higher education during this period produced a variety of expectations and contradictions about the future of the institution. It was a period of turbulence, excitement, and growth as well as confusion.

It was also during this period that some administrators and faculty began to consider seriously the predictions of declining enrollments in the 1980s and the potential effects the projected decline would have on the University. The tenure policy was examined to find out how it would be possible to have enough instructors for the high enrollment periods of the 60s, 70s, and early 80s and yet avoid the problems of releasing tenured faculty later when enrollments fell. The temporary contract was used more deliberately and frequently although a formal quota was never established. During the last two years, all new positions and vacancies are considered temporary until a regular contract position which might lead to tenure has been justified. The net effect has been to make it more difficult to achieve tenure for those on regular contracts and maintain a relatively high percentage of persons who may never expect to achieve tenure or teach full time at Illinois State beyond a maximum of seven years. In the fall semester of 1977, thirty-two percent of all persons employed primarily as teachers (approximately 1,000) were on temporary contracts, either full-time (17%), or part-time (15%). The staffing projections through 1982 indicate this percentage will remain virtually unchanged.

Temporary appointments as defined in the University's Constitution are for a specific purpose and for a term appropriate to that purpose. Notice of a decision not to reappoint is unnecessary for a faculty member on temporary appointment; the University, however, may offer to renew a temporary appointment to a faculty member on temporary appointment,* and in such a circumstance, service in a temporary appointment shall count toward tenure in the probationary period. All temporary appointments are for one academic year. By contrast, tenure appointments are indefinite. Nontenure appointments are for a specified term contingent on previous teaching experience and require specific times when information must be provided regarding the intention of the University not to renew the contract. Tenure is possible but not guaranteed for persons on nontenure appointments. In brief, the practical difference between temporary and tenure or nontenure appointments is the assurance of continuing employment: temporary faculty have none, tenured faculty have maximum assurance, and nontenured faculty assume a relatively high probability.

---

*Affirmative Action policies require that all regular (nontenure) positions must be filled by a search procedure which entails national, local, and campus advertising. Persons on temporary appointments in positions which have been converted to nontenure status may be applicants.

Due to the importance of temporary faculty to the University, this study was designed to understand better what are the personal and institutional conditions of temporary employment which encourage or inhibit participation in the full range of faculty activities. A questionnaire was sent to all teaching faculty at Illinois State University in the fall semester, 1977. The purpose was to identify similarities and differences between faculty with regular contracts and those with temporary contracts on the following dimensions: personal and professional characteristics, job expectations, impact on decision making, job satisfaction, access to resources, and commitment to remaining at Illinois State University. Responses were anonymous.

Additional data sources included university records dealing with credit hour generation and interviews with 18 departmental chairpersons out of a total of 31, and 18 full-time faculty on temporary contracts. The persons interviewed were selected to insure that all colleges were represented, and that departments most affected by temporary faculty were included. The temporary faculty were selected also to coincide with the departments from which the chairpersons were interviewed.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for the computer analysis of data. Where the differences between tenured and nontenured faculty were minimal, data for the two groups were combined and reported as regular faculty. Also, due to the relatively low rate of return from part-time faculty, the data from this group were generally omitted from the analysis. For the most part, comparisons in this study were made between the regular and full-time temporary faculty.

In a number of situations, results of a subanalysis are reported where full-time temporary faculty with doctorates are compared with regular nontenured faculty having doctorates. Outside of employment status, these two groups tend to be at similar points in their professional careers.

RESULTS

Questionnaire

Return Rate. The distribution and return rates of the questionnaire by employment status are given in Table 1.* Of the 984 questionnaires distributed, 564 (57%) were returned and useable. Part-time temporary faculty had the lowest rate of return--44 percent. For the remaining three categories of employment status, the combined rate of return was 60 percent. The percent of faculty within each employment status from a given college is a reasonable representation of the University distribution, in most cases being within 2 or 3 percentage points of the University figures, and in all cases being within 5 percentage points of University figures.

Characteristics. The characteristics of the respondents by employment status are given in Table 2. There is a strong association between employment status and rank. The large majority (79%) of tenured faculty are ranked as professors or associate professors; the regular, nontenured faculty are primarily associate or assistant professors

*All Tables are attached as appendices to the report.

(94%); the full-time, as well as the part-time, temporary faculty are almost exclusively assistant professors, instructors or lecturers (98% and 100% respectively). When comparing the different categories of employment status on the basis of college in which rank is held, the distribution across colleges shows only minor variations. The College of Arts and Sciences, being the largest college, has the greatest proportion of each category of faculty; however, relative to its size, the College of Business employs a disproportionately larger share of part-time temporary faculty.

Males outnumber females 4 to 1 among the tenured faculty. The ratio drops slightly among the regular nontenured faculty, but males and females are represented equally in the temporary faculty. As expected, tenured faculty are older than nontenured or temporary faculty. The median age for tenured faculty is over 45 years, for nontenured faculty the median is under 36 years, and for both categories of temporary faculty, the median is less than 34 years.

The predominant degree for regular faculty is the doctorate. By contrast, the most common degree held by temporary faculty is the master's, but 39 percent of the full-time temporaries have the doctoral degree. In terms of teaching experience at Illinois State, 90 percent of the tenured faculty have taught more than six years. By contrast, fewer than 10 percent of the nontenured faculty have a comparable record of teaching experience, and one-third of the temporary faculty are in their first year. Similarly, the tenured faculty reported more teaching experience at other institutions of higher education.

Job Expectations. Faculty were asked to respond to two questions for each professional activity given in a list: (1) Do you want to be involved in the activity? and (2) Are you expected by your departmental chairperson or colleagues to be involved in the activity? Responses were on a four point scale: 1=Definitely no, 2=Generally no, 3=Generally yes, and 4=Definitely yes. Categories 1 and 2, as well as 3 and 4, were combined to simplify the analysis.

Since differences between tenured and nontenured faculty were minimal, the data from these two groups were combined and reported as regular faculty. Also, because of the relatively lower rate of return from part-time faculty, they were not included in this analysis. Comparisons, then, between the regular faculty and the full-time temporary faculty on the WANT and EXPECTED variables are given in Table 3.

In terms of wanting to be involved, regular faculty are different from temporary faculty in only three respects: regular faculty were more interested in serving on university committees and on dissertation/thesis committees, and less interested in tutoring students. Yet, when the perceived expectation of others is considered, a lower percentage of full-time temporary faculty systematically feel they are expected to be involved in the activities listed. There are significant differences in all but two areas: tutoring students and professional service to the community. The areas of greatest difference, where more of the regular faculty perceive an expectation by others to be involved, are service on department, college or university committees, service on thesis/dissertation committees, and designing new courses or programs.

The differences in interest in serving on university committees and on dissertation/thesis committees do not hold up when controlling for terminal degree. The low percentage of temporary faculty without the doctorate who are interested in these activities accounts for the difference between temporary and regular faculty. On the other hand, the differences in perceived expectations cannot be attributed to the lack of a doctorate for the large percentage of full-time temporary faculty. In a subanalysis, a comparison of faculty members with doctorates, those on regular contract but nontenured (N=74) vs. full-time temporary (N=36), showed similar results to that of the primary analysis: fewer full-time temporary faculty perceived they were expected to become involved in the listed activities. These results are reported in Table 4.

Decision-Making. The questionnaire contained a list of factors which entailed a decision by others that may affect the faculty member's workload. The faculty were to respond to two questions for each factor: (1) What importance do you feel IS placed by your departmental chairperson or colleagues on your preferences in making the decision? and (2) What importance do you feel SHOULD BE placed on your preferences in making the decision? Responses were on a 5-point scale: 1=No importance; 2=Low importance; 3=Medium importance; 4=High importance; 5=Extremely high importance. Again, because of minimal differences between tenured and nontenured regular faculty, results are reported for regular and full-time temporary faculty, only, in Table 5.

In the comparison of regular faculty with full-time temporaries on the IS dimension of 17 factors, there were 12 significant differences which, in each case, showed that temporary faculty perceived less importance is being placed on their preferences than do regular faculty. But, on the SHOULD BE dimension, there were only five significant differences between the two groups and in each case, temporary faculty felt less importance should be placed on their preferences than did regular faculty members.

By taking the difference between the SHOULD BE and IS ratings, a discrepancy score was computed for each respondent. Results for regular and full-time temporary faculty are reported in Table 6. In comparing the two groups of faculty there are seven significant differences (10 nonsignificant differences) in mean discrepancies. In each case temporary faculty show the greater discrepancies. The seven factors are in rank order from high to low: (1) which courses a faculty member teaches; (2) how large the classes will be; (3) when a faculty member finds out what courses she/he is scheduled to teach; (4) committee assignments; (5) advising load; (6) summer teaching assignment; (7) choosing textbooks for the courses a faculty member teaches.

Job Satisfaction. Faculty indicated the extent of their satisfaction with each of 12 factors associated with their job on a four-point scale: 1=Definitely not satisfied; 2=Generally not satisfied; 3=Generally satisfied; 4=Definitely satisfied. The responses were combined into two categories: not satisfied and satisfied. The percent of regular and full-time temporary faculty expressing satisfaction with each factor is given in Table 7. *

*With reference to the part-time temporary faculty, peer recognition of work and opportunities for committee work were areas of least satisfaction, although 60 percent of the respondents did indicate they were satisfied with these two factors.

More than 50 percent of both groups of faculty expressed satisfaction in all but two areas: time for research, and salary. Significant differences between the two groups occurred in four areas: there was greater satisfaction among the temporary faculty with clerical support services, and there was greater satisfaction among the regular faculty with the time when classes meet, peer recognition of work, and opportunities for committee work. For the latter two factors, the differences in satisfaction were even greater in the subanalysis (degree = doctorate) comparing regular nontenured and full-time temporary faculty.

Supplemental Benefits. The questionnaire contained a list of eleven supplemental benefits and faculty were asked how they would rate their chances of receiving the benefit if they were to submit a request. The possible responses were (1) uncertain what the benefit is, (2) would not submit a request, (3) no chance, (4) less than 50/50, (5) about 50/50, and ( ) greater than 50/50.

It was not possible to determine why faculty would not submit a request, e.g., they had other plans or because they felt they had no chance for approval of a request. For whatever reason, when this category is combined with "uncertain what the benefit is," from 40 to 50 percent of the full-time temporary faculty checked these two categories for the instructional development grants compared to 20 to 30 percent of the regular faculty. For the research grants/appointment, the corresponding percentages were 30 percent for temporary faculty versus 20 percent for regular faculty, and for a summer teaching assignment, 15 percent for temporary versus 10 percent for regular faculty.

Based on those who would submit a request, i.e., checked responses 3 through 6, a 2x4 chi-square test of independence was run to compare regular faculty with the full-time temporary faculty. For ease of reporting, the percent that perceived their chances of approval to be at least 50/50 is reported in Table 8.*

For all forms of instructional development and research grants/appointments, for a graduate teaching assistant and for a summer teaching assignment, the temporary faculty rated their chances of approval significantly lower than did the regular faculty. Similar results were obtained in a subanalysis (degree = doctorate) comparing regular nontenured and full-time temporary faculty. It is worthwhile to note though, that 50 percent of the temporary faculty with doctorates felt they had no chance of receiving research reassigned time during the academic year as opposed to 11 percent for regular nontenured faculty.

Institutional Commitment. Three questions were arranged in a summated scale to measure commitment. Faculty were asked to indicate that, if given the opportunity, would they remain at Illinois State or move to a small liberal arts college, a Big Ten university, or a major private university. The minimum score was 3, and the maximum

*Part-time temporary faculty generally see these benefits as being unavailable to them. From 50-70 percent would not submit requests; of those that would, the majority see themselves as having no chance to receive the benefit.

was 12. The higher the score the greater the commitment to ISU. The results are reported in Table 9.

The commitment score was significantly lower for full-time temporary faculty than for regular faculty. And in the subanalysis (degree = doctorate), there was a more pronounced difference between the regular nontenured faculty and full-time temporary faculty.

Interviews

Department Chairpersons. The chairpersons from 18 of 31 departments were interviewed to obtain additional information about the differences and similarities in the employment conditions of regular and temporary faculty. The interviews were organized around eight categories or themes: (1) regular/temporary ratio, (2) hiring procedures, (3) value of classifications, (4) rights and privileges, (5) extracurricular incentives, (6) evaluation procedures, (7) respect, and (8) policy changes.

In general, the preferred ratio of regular to temporary faculty is 80/20, and one department is considering 60/40. Many reasons were given for the ratio of regular to temporary faculty members in the departments. One-third of the chairpersons said the decision was made by the Dean of the college or the Provost, but the majority mentioned a variety of other factors. Among these were historical accident, formal staffing plans, availability of qualified faculty, course offerings and demand, and attempts by tenured faculty to protect summer teaching assignments.

Hiring procedures for regular positions are carefully prescribed under the equal employment opportunity and affirmative action policies of the University. On the other hand, while the same procedures are recommended for hiring temporary faculty, greater flexibility is allowed under certain circumstances. Almost one-half of the chairpersons said they advertised nationally for full-time temporary positions and used a selection procedure similar to the one used for regular faculty positions. Approximately one-third said the procedure for hiring temporary faculty was less rigorous and seldom involved national advertising. Written assurance of employment beyond the specific contractual period is not allowed, but a few chairpersons said they were willing to suggest the possibility orally in areas where there is a scarcity of qualified persons.

In general, full-time temporary faculty are seen as a buffer against the effects of future declines in enrollment, or as a source of new ideas, or as a way of exploring new curriculum areas without making a permanent commitment. But they do not provide continuity, commitment, or a full range of participation in University matters. Part-time faculty are used to fill the gaps at the last minute, but for some chairpersons part-time faculty create more problems than they solve. By contrast, regular faculty provide continuity, commitment, and a full range of activities, but they also "lock-in" the department to existing programs. Some departments which have a high percent of tenured faculty must wait until a substantial number of retirements occur before they can move into new or necessary areas.

In the "caste" system of the University, tenured faculty are the first-class citizens with full rights and privileges. In descending order, then, are the regular nontenured and temporary faculty. The latter group in thirteen of the eighteen departments were said to have almost full access to all resources and benefits other than summer teaching assignments, voting on personnel matters, and full membership in the graduate faculty. But in the other five departments, temporary faculty were not eligible for summer teaching assignments, had the worst office facilities and teaching schedules, seldom received travel funds, and were not expected to attend departmental meetings nor vote on important matters. In these departments, second-class citizenship has a very unambiguous meaning.

For the regular faculty, incentives to undertake activities outside the classroom such as research, instructional development and service are provided through the salary, promotion, and tenure process. Other less formal means of encouragement are used also in most departments. Temporary faculty may be advised to do something to improve their employment chances, but they are neither penalized if they don't do anything or rewarded for their efforts if they do.

The same data is requested from regular and temporary faculty for the evaluation of their efforts during the previous year. But, in most departments, very little importance is given to the data for the temporary faculty. As long as their teaching is acceptable, apparently very little more is essential.

Temporary faculty are treated with varying degrees of acceptance and respect. In some departments it was reported the prejudice is due to their employment status--either the regular faculty treat them as second-class citizens or the temporary faculty act as if they were. More frequently, prejudice is an issue of personalities rather than employment status.

Finally, the chairpersons were asked if changes in the employment policy were desirable. Although a wide variety of responses were given, there seemed to be very little desire for a major overhaul of current practices; instead the reactions seem to reflect a desire for selected cosmetic changes. One of the more common suggestions was the desirability of limiting all temporary appointments to 3 or 4 years. Others felt there should be more leeway in deciding the number of renewals allowed, but only two chairpersons felt all appointments should be regular.

Temporary Faculty. Eighteen or approximately 10 percent of the full-time temporary faculty--one from each department of the chairpersons that were interviewed--were asked to answer questions about the conditions of temporary employment. Eight had the doctorate. Each person consented to an interview and responded to ten types of questions: (1) hiring procedures, (2) contractual responsibilities, (3) evaluation, (4) extra-curricular incentives, (5) employment motives, (6) "second class" citizenship, (7) uses and abuses, (8) proselytizing, (9) future plans, and (10) feelings about status.

Fifteen of the eighteen respondents have been at Illinois State more than one year, but the majority were hired in 1976. Only one is approaching the maximum number of years of employment (7) in 1978 allowed under the University's Constitution; two will reach this limitation in 1979. According to each, they were hired for the academic year or nine months; however, several said they were told they could expect to have their contracts renewed if their performance were satisfactory. The length of time varied from a vague promise of one or more years to a precise maximum. One-third said it had been implied that the position might be converted to a regular position at a later date, but the other two-thirds said it was made very clear at the time of hiring that there was absolutely no chance for the position to become a regular appointment.

All but one of the temporary faculty were hired to teach, but four of the eighteen had partial responsibilities in supervision or administration of programs. Several indicated they were hired primarily to teach the introductory or survey courses, but the majority said they were expected to teach some advanced as well as introductory level courses. Only one person said that research was expected; none felt that they were expected to participate actively in the governances processes of the department or the University.

Each department of the University is required to have a committee to review and evaluate the activities of the faculty during the previous year. Most of the temporary faculty who were interviewed said they submitted the same type of data including student evaluations as did the regular faculty, but very few believed the data were given the same scrutiny or were considered as important. Some decisions about the continuation of contracts were said to be made by committees, others by the chairperson. The time when they knew their contract would be renewed for the following year varied from January until just before classes started in August; the modal time was March.

Ten of the respondents said they were given no reason to do more than they believed they were hired to do, i.e., teach, although several indicated they were encouraged to finish their dissertations and some said they were expected to do research to improve their resumes. Only a few said they received tangible assistance to support their extra work such as special commodities, computer time, and reassigned time during the regular academic year or summer.

The reasons for accepting a full-time temporary position at Illinois State were almost as varied as the number of respondents. The most common response was to get back into teaching; only one indicated a family restriction. Among the other responses were to obtain teaching experience, most attractive job offered, the only job available, get out of large cities and avoid the social problems of smaller schools in smaller communities, and the job was close to home.

Almost one-half of the respondents said they had no sense of second class citizenship, even though some wished they had more of a voice in governance matters. Four were equivocal, but were critical of the underfunding of the department, awkwardness in departmental meetings, chance to vote, and concern over the future if one "stepped out of line." The others were very certain they were second class citizens.

Eight of the temporary faculty who were interviewed said they had no sense of being abused by the University, although six had complaints about their employment, e.g., the course load was too heavy and they were last-minute replacements. The other four persons said the teaching experience at Illinois State strengthened their credentials and they were able to "use" this experience to find employment elsewhere.

More than three-fourths of the temporary faculty said they would encourage their friends to accept positions at Illinois State under similar conditions, but the other five would not do so for various reasons, such as temporary contracts are "nerve racking," and post-doctoral programs in research are preferable to establish a publication record.

Most of the persons interviewed were either anticipating or actively seeking positions at other institutions. All commented on the amount of time taken from other interests, such as research, to engage in job-seeking activities. And only a few said they were given special help by Illinois State to obtain other positions.

In a concluding note, two-thirds of the respondents felt the temporary positions were appropriate for the University and were generally acceptable personally as long as the conditions of employment were understood at the time of employment. The major complaint was the psychological strain of not knowing whether employment would be continued or terminated.

DISCUSSION

This study was done to understand better what are the conditions of temporary employment which encourage or limit participation in the full range of activities expected of regular faculty. Although temporary employment is not new to higher education--all faculty appointments may be considered temporary until tenure is awarded--very little is known about the temporary faculty at four year colleges and universities such as educational preparation, professional experience, why they accept temporary employment, what they do in and outside the classroom, what they believe they are expected to do, their satisfaction with the job, and what they will do in the future. Nor is very little known how these characteristics differ from those of regular faculty.

Locally, the information from this study was believed to be useful to Illinois State University because it would provide data for one-third of the faculty which had not been available. Presumably, the data could be used to improve decisions about employment and suggest more appropriate institutional responses to the needs, possibilities, and problems of the temporary faculty. From a cosmopolitan viewpoint, it was believed the study would make a contribution to an area in which very little is known, that is, the characteristics of faculty in higher education. Salaries, effectiveness, administrative arrangements and other performance or organizational conditions in higher education have been examined extensively, but the perceptions, aspirations, motivations, and other characteristics of faculty <u>as persons</u> apparently have not been as popular as subjects of systematic examination.

Because so little is known about the personal characteristics of faculty, this study was intended to be exploratory only. The questionnaire was constructed from information derived from several studies in the community colleges, personal observations and speculations, as well as conversations with several temporary faculty and chairpersons at Illinois State. The interviews were used to explore additional areas of interest which were not covered adequately by the questionnaire. As a result, the data are used primarily for descriptions of faculty characteristics rather than for tests of hypotheses, although certain tentative generalizations seem appropriate.

Temporary faculty, in general, are younger than the regular faculty and correspondingly have fewer years of teaching experience both at Illinois State and elsewhere. A much smaller percentage of the temporary faculty have completed the doctorate; a master's degree is the highest degree held by the majority and a relatively high percentage of the part-time respondents hold only a bachelor's degree; however, this group of relatively inexperienced and less well prepared faculty are responsible for a substantial portion of the University's instructional program.

During the fall 1976 semester, temporary faculty were responsible for approximately one-fourth of all instruction and slightly more than twenty-seven percent of the credit hours generated primarily but not exclusively in the lower and upper division courses. Responsibility for all credit hours produced at each level was distributed as follows: freshman/sophomore courses, 28.8%; junior/senior courses, 27%; advanced undergraduate and lower-level graduate courses, 14.4%; and advanced graduate courses, 5.9%. It may be assumed the contributions of the temporary faculty during the fall 1977 semester were similar to 1976 although data are not available yet. The total number of temporary instructional personnel in 1977 (317) is almost the same as in 1976 (312). And the distribution of full-time and part-time faculty among departments is much the same for each year.

There are few significant differences between the temporary* and regular faculty in terms of what they want to do on the job, the extent to which they feel their opinions should be considered by the chairperson and colleagues in various departmental decisions, or the level of job satisfaction. However, there are many differences regarding the extent to which they perceive they are expected by the chairpersons and colleagues to be involved in activities outside the classroom or the extent to which their opinions are considered in decision making. In general, temporary faculty are hired for teaching only and are not expected to participate in governance matters of the department or the University. Although the personal aspirations of temporary and regular faculty are more alike than different, their actual roles in the University are perceived clearly as being different.

It might be assumed that the temporary faculty would feel frustrated and even angry that their aspirations were restricted by their employment status, but there is

---

*Unless otherwise indicated, the term "temporary faculty" refers to those on full-time appointments.

very little evidence that this is true. Undoubtedly, there are some temporary faculty who are very unhappy--some were interviewed earlier--but the number seems to be relatively small. Second class citizenship for most of the respondents to the questionnaire and the interviews may not be an honor, but it is a fact that most accept as a necessary, if unfortunate, condition of temporary employment.

This is not to suggest there are no problems. Both regular and temporary faculty were very dissatisfied with the amount of time that was available for research, and the salary levels. Both groups were relatively unhappy about the way that teaching is evaluated and the equity of the workload. The regular faculty also were critical of the clerical support services. By contrast, the temporary faculty apparently were satisfied with the clerical service but were unhappy about peer recognition of their work and their opportunities for committee work.

In essence, temporary faculty are "invisible" due not so much from personal preference but more from the unintentional consequences of institutional policies, although policies in some departments are designed deliberately to produce this effect. Of course, temporary faculty are visible to the students in their classrooms, but classrooms, even for the majority of the temporary faculty are very private worlds restricted to a small number of students and the teacher. Outside the classroom, temporary faculty are not expected to participate in public events in many departments. Frequently, they are not expected to attend departmental meetings or, if they do, are not encouraged to participate in the more important decisions. The temporary faculty are not encouraged to do research, engage in University governance matters,* nor attend professional meetings off-campus. There are some temporary faculty who do these things, but it appears they do them because they want to--despite institutional obstacles.

The part-time faculty are the most invisible of the temporary faculty. Apparently there are major problems of communication as suggested by the return rate for the questionnaire in this study. Other obligations make it impossible for some to attend departmental meetings, and they frequently teach at times when other faculty have left campus so they may never be known by other persons in the department and, aside from the time in the classroom, even their students have difficulty seeing them.

So far, this report has been limited to a description of the way things are at Illinois State University in the fall semester of 1977. As a closure, the remainder is devoted to suggestions for alternative ways in which temporary faculty status may be used more effectively and efficiently by the University, and what the University can or should do for the temporary faculty to improve their professional and personal lives. To some extent, this part of the discussion "goes beyond the data," but the data provide the foundation.

---

*Only three percent of almost 200 faculty serving on the standing committees of the Academic Senate are temporary faculty.

To place these suggestions in perspective, there are certain contextual variables that should be noted. First, it is unlikely that Illinois State University will obtain sufficient funds in the foreseeable future for a substantial increase in services or the number of new faculty positions to alleviate some of the concerns expressed by the faculty in this study. Second, attempts to accommodate the desire for more research time, or better clerical services, or reduced teaching loads must come from reallocations of available resources. And third, there is no reason to doubt the doomsday predictions of declining enrollments in the 80s and the potential effects this may have on the institution.

With these facts in mind and the data from this study, two models are suggested for the conditions of employment for temporary faculty. Each has limitations as well as the possibility for compromise.

In the first model, temporary faculty are hired only to teach but are given maximum assistance in achieving personal objectives which will enhance their opportunities for employment elsewhere in higher education. This would include an appropriate teaching load comparable to the regular faculty, but would not require that temporary faculty be expected to engage in other extracurricular matters beyond those which would be useful personally. In fact, temporary faculty should be informed explicitly in their contracts that the University expects all such faculty to teach effectively and engage only in those activities which are appropriate and important to future employment at another institution. Participation on committees, community service, or anything else which might subtract time from research, writing or other relevant activities should be discouraged. Full and equal access should be provided to travel funds, computer time, laboratory and library facilties, commodities, supplies, clerical help, graduate assistants, or whatever is necessary to facilitate such activities. Whenever possible, regular faculty should assist their temporary colleagues through advice, direct help, and even joint authorship of projects. Employment should be assured for a sufficient length of time beyond one year, as long as the teaching performance is acceptable, to permit satisfactory progress toward the completion of the activities which will aid their move.

In the second model, temporary faculty are hired only to teach but are required to carry a heavier teaching load than regular faculty. As in the first model, temporary faculty should not be expected to participate in any formal governance matters of the department and the University but, unlike the first model, they should not be allowed access to travel, research, or other funds which are not directly related to their teaching responsibilities; nor should the temporary faculty be given any expectation that their total period of employment at Illinois State would exceed one year. The temporary faculty, on the other hand, should expect the University to be more than a "sweat shop." Many of the temporary faculty said they accepted a position at Illinois State because it provided a chance to improve or establish their teaching ability, therefore, they should be given help in achieving this goal while they are employed. Someone from the regular faculty who has the ability and interest should be given reassigned time (provided by the extra loads carried by the temporary faculty) to coordinate, assist, and work directly with the temporary faculty. This could include instructional development projects for the temporary faculty, and programs for faculty development such as the Kellogg Project

at Illinois State, could provide assistance to these regular faculty coordinators. For those temporary faculty who are in disciplines where research and publications are important for employment, they should be encouraged to undertake their own work but not at the expense of the regular faculty.

For both models contract forms should be created which specify clearly the work load, salary, term, and restrictions of temporary employment. Furthermore, all temporary academic appointments should carry the designation of "visiting" as part of the rank designation to denote clearly their temporary status, e.g., Visiting Instructor in Art, Visiting Associate Professor of History, or Visiting Lecturer in Economics. Efforts should be made to increase the number of persons who hold the terminal degree in their field and have records of acceptable teaching experience. This includes a greater concern for the screening of persons for these positions. At present, the high percentage of temporary faculty who hold only a master's degree suggests the possibility of a reduction in the quality of instruction. Correspondingly, a greater concern should be given to the evaluation of the temporary faculty's teaching performance, and notice of intention to renew or not to renew contracts for full time temporary faculty should be given as early as possible.

The advantages in the first model are primarily for the temporary faculty and reflect a humane concern by the institution to compensate as much as possible those persons it is hiring only for a short time to satisfy a current need. But it does nothing to resolve the problems identified by regular and temporary faculty alike. If anything, it will reduce the resources available to all groups. By contrast, the second model is designed to "exploit" temporary employment to the advantage of the regular faculty. For example, if the teaching load of each full-time temporary person at Illinois State were increased by three hours, approximately 43 full-time research positions could be assigned to the regular faculty each semester. While this may seem oppressive to the temporary faculty, it should be noted that many of the temporary faculty are not expected to assume any responsibility for the myriad extracurricular activities required of regular faculty. If the number of preparations were limited to two, then an additional three-hour load would tend to make the work load of both groups more equitable and respond directly to the serious concern for additional research time. Presumably, some aspects of each model could be used; the mix would depend on the discipline, the department and the University.

References

Jabker, E. H. and Halinski, R. S. Instructional development and faculty rewards. Journal of Higher Education, 1978, in press.

Magarrell, J. Part-time professors on the increase. The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. XV, No. 18, 1978.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION AND RETURN RATE OF
QUESTIONNAIRE BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Employment Status	Number Distributed	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Regular Faculty: Tenured	514	302	59
Regular Faculty: Not Tenured	153	101	66
Temporary Faculty: Full Time	167	95	57
Temporary Faculty: Part-Time	150	66	44
Total	984	564	57

TABLE 2
CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS:
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS WITHIN EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	Regular: Tenured (N-302)	Regular: Not Tenured (N=101)	Temporary: Full-Time (N=95)	Temporary: Part-Time (N=66)
Rank				
Professor	45%	2%	2%	0%
Associate Professor	34	27	0	0
Assistant Professor	20	67	50	18
Instructor, lecturer, other	1	4	48	82
College				
Arts and Sciences	49%	43%	51%	37%
Applied Science & Tech.	18	20	12	9
Business	5	13	14	25
Education	16	13	14	14
Fine Arts	11	10	9	15
Sex				
Male	80%	73%	53%	51%
Female	20	27	47	49
Age				
34 and below	11%	46%	61%	55%
35-44	35	38	25	30
45-54	38	13	10	11
55 and below	16	3	4	5
Highest Degree Earned				
Doctorate	86%	74%	39%	20%
Master's	13	21	57	61
Bachelor's	0	0	3	11
Other	1	5	1	8
Years of teaching experience at ISU:				
First year	0%	23%	33%	37%
1-3	1	42	36	28
4-6	9	33	23	27
7-9	34	2	5	5
10 or more	56	0	3	3
Years of teaching experience in higher education exclusive of ISU:				
None	26%	33%	46%	64%
1-2	24	29	24	19
3-4	12	7	10	9
5-6	7	14	9	5
More than 6	31	17	11	3

TABLE 3
JOB EXPECTATIONS:
COMPARISON OF REGULAR FACULTY WITH FULL-TIME TEMPORARY FACULTY

Activities	Percent of faculty that WANT to be involved in the activity				Percent of faculty that believe they are EXPECTED to be involved in the activity			
	Regular (N=403)	Temporary Full-Time (N=95)	Corrected Chi-Square (df=1)	Sig.	Regular (N=403)	Temporary Full-Time (N=95)	Corrected Chi-Square (df=1)	Sig.
Research	88%	84%	0.93	NS	88%	63%	30.08	.001
Publication	88	83	1.12	NS	89	70	18.68	.001
Department Committees	83	76	2.43	NS	93	63	54.55	.001
College Committees	65	56	2.20	NS	78	38	55.74	.001
University Committees	64	45	10.30	.001	74	28	68.00	.001
Administration	35	32	0.17	NS	35	22	4.62	.32
Formal Advising of Students	62	67	0.76	NS	59	46	4.67	.031
Tutoring Students	39	52	4.92	.027	35	34	0.01	NS
Writing Funding Proposals	54	57	0.20	NS	57	36	13.58	.001
Designing New Courses or Programs	88	83	1.41	NS	81	53	30.79	.001
Serving on Thesis/Diss. Committees	81	57	22.37	.001	69	22	67.66	.001
Developing Instructional Materials	88	84	0.67	NS	78	66	5.66	.017
Revise Existing Courses/ Programs	92	88	1.16	NS	86	65	21.62	.001
Professional Service to Community	78	76	0.12	NS	68	57	3.15	NS
Off-Campus Non-Credit Program	37	43	1.12	NS	35	22	5.62	.018

TABLE 4
JOB EXPECTATIONS: COMPARISON OF EXPECTATIONS BY OTHERS FOR REGULAR NONTENURED AND FULL-TIME TEMPORARY FACULTY WITH DOCTORATES

Activities	Percent that believe they are EXPECTED to be involved in the activity		Corrected Chi-Square	Sig.
	Regular Nontenured (N=75)	Temporary Full-time (N=37)		
Research	94	79	4.11	.042
Publication	94	86	1.28	NS
Department Committees	97	57	25.39	.001
College Committees	81	35	18.93	.001
University Committees	72	27	16.44	.001
Administration	38	9	8.39	.004
Formal Advising of Students	65	34	7.62	.006
Tutoring Students	31	31	.04	NS
Writing Funding Proposals	71	50	3.70	.054
Designing New Course or Program	81	51	8.87	.003
Serving on Thesis/Diss. Committee	69	35	9.40	.002
Developing Instructional Materials	74	57	2.24	NS
Revise Existing Course or Program	89	57	12.25	.001
Professional Service to Community	80	49	9.44	.002
Off-Campus Non-Credit Courses	38	20	2.74	NS

TABLE 5
PERCEIVED INFLUENCE ON DECISION-MAKING:
COMPARISON OF REGULAR WITH FULL-TIME TEMPORARY FACULTY

	IS[1]				SHOULD BE[2]			
	Regular Mean	Temporary: Full-time Mean	t	Sig.	Regular Mean	Temporary: Full-time Mean	t	Sig.
The courses you will teach	3.69	3.09	5.37	.001	4.17	4.01	1.94	NS
When your courses will meet	3.11	2.71	3.35	.001	3.64	3.46	1.75	NS
How large your classes will be	3.17	2.81	2.82	.005	3.65	3.67	.26	NS
If you will be teaching off-campus	3.38	3.04	2.10	.037	3.74	3.38	2.52	.012
If you will be given a summer teaching assignment	3.39	2.87	3.75	.001	3.92	3.67	2.18	.029
How your teaching will be evaluated	3.21	2.82	2.95	.003	4.02	3.85	1.80	NS
Committee assignments	3.20	2.58	5.29	.001	3.68	3.35	3.43	.001
Advising load	2.92	2.56	2.45	.015	3.43	3.32	.77	NS
Office Facilities	2.92	2.57	2.68	.008	3.62	3.35	2.61	.009
Student Assistants	2.81	2.64	1.22	NS	3.57	3.49	.78	NS
Clerical assistance	2.76	2.86	.70	NS	3.77	3.67	.91	NS
Research assistance	2.68	2.34	2.35	.019	3.67	3.33	2.76	.006
Number of courses you will teach in a semester	3.21	3.02	1.37	NS	3.98	3.93	.51	NS
Number of different preparations in a semester	3.21	3.11	.72	NS	4.04	3.94	.94	NS
Number of different courses you will teach from semester to semester	3.16	2.94	1.60	NS	3.99	3.94	.54	NS
Choosing textbooks for courses you will teach	3.87	3.53	2.29	.022	4.10	4.00	.74	NS
When you find out what courses you are scheduled	3.35	3.03	2.30	.022	3.93	3.96	.21	NS

[1] Refers to the question: What importance do you feel IS placed by your departmental chairperson or colleagues on your preferences in making the decision?

[2] Refers to the question: What importance do you feel SHOULD BE placed on your preferences in making the decision.

NOTE: For both questions, the scale for responding was: 1 = No importance, 2 = Low importance, 3 = Medium importance, 4 = High importance, 5 = Extremely high importance.

TABLE 6
COMPARISON OF MEAN DISCREPANCY SCORES[1]
FOR REGULAR AND FULL-TIME TEMPORARY FACULTY

	Regular Mean	Temporary Full-time Mean	t	Sig.
The courses you will teach	.48	.92	3.72	.001
Where your courses will meet	.52	.75	1.91	NS
How large your classes will be	.47	.88	3.05	.002
If you will be teaching off-campus	.36	.33	.20	NS
If you will be given a summer teaching assignment	.53	.80	2.02	.044
How your teaching will be evaluated	.80	1.03	1.50	NS
Committee assignments	.47	.78	2.44	.015
Advising load	.50	.79	2.18	.030
Office facilities	.69	.80	.74	NS
Student assistants	.77	.89	.87	NS
Clerical assistance	1.00	.85	1.02	NS
Research assistance	.99	1.01	.11	NS
Number of courses you will teach in a semester	.77	.91	1.07	NS
Number of different preparations in a semester	.83	.83	.01	NS
Number of different courses you will teach from semester to semester	.83	1.01	1.19	NS
Choosing textbooks for courses you will teach	.23	.50	2.62	.009
When you find out what courses you are scheduled to teach	.58	.93	2.43	.015

[1]Discrepancy scores are calculated by subtracting the IS rating from the SHOULD BE rating for each respondent.

TABLE 7
JOB SATISFACTION: PERCENT OF REGULAR FULL-TIME TEMPORARY FACULTY REPORTING SATISFACTION WITH SELECTED JOB CONDITIONS

Job Conditions	Percent Satisfied: Regular (N=394)	Percent Satisfied: Temporary: Full-Time (N=91)	Corrected Chi-Square	Sig.
Teaching Support Services	75%	81%	1.47	NS
Office Facilities	75	70	0.77	NS
Clerical Support Services	56	73	8.84	.003
Manner of Evaluating Teaching	55	51	0.47	NS
Size of Classes	86	81	0.92	NS
Time When Classes Meet	90	78	9.15	.003
Type of Courses Teaching	92	86	3.36	NS
Time for Research	34	36	0.10	NS
Equity of Overall Workload	55	60	0.60	NS
Peer Recognition of Work	69	56	5.07	.024
Opportunities for Committee Work	88	57	44.69	.001
Salary	40	48	1.85	NS

TABLE 8
PERCEIVED ACCESS TO SUPPLEMENTAL BENEFITS:
COMPARISON OF REGULAR AND FULL-TIME TEMPORARY FACULTY[1]

Resource	Percent that perceived their chances of approval to be at least 50/50		Chi-Square (df=3)	Sig.
	Regular	Temporary: Full-Time		
Summer Instructional Development Program Grant	66	46	14.00	.002
Academic Year Instructional Development Program Grant	66	39	18.70	.001
Restricted Instructional Development Program Grant	71	44	22.30	.001
Summer Research Appointment	44	21	32.96	.001
Academic Year Research Grant	45	19	39.95	.001
Academic Year Research Reassigned Time	53	26	30.96	.001
Student Assistant	48	54	1.84	NS
Undergraduate Teaching Assistant	49	44	.90	NS
Graduate Teaching Assistant	47	27	13.66	.003
Professional Travel Funds	53	48	.89	NS
Summer Teaching Assignment	80	53	45.36	.001

[1]Based on those who indicated they would submit a request.

TABLE 9
COMMITMENT: SELECTED COMPARISONS

Group	N	Mean	S D	t	Two-tail Probability
Regular	375	9.21	2.37	3.16	.002
Temporary: Full-Time	93	8.31	2.75		
With doctoral degrees:					
Regular: Nontenured	71	8.94	2.19	3.46	.001
Temporary: Full-Time	34	7.24	2.71		